

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIQUIDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00770
Patent 9,604,901

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. THE '901 PATENT IS THE PROPER FOCUS OF THIS PROCEEDING2

 A. The '901 Patent Claimed Subject Matter2

 B. The '393 Patent and the '901 Patent Claim Different Inventions4

 C. Liquidia Ignores the Context and Purpose of the '901 Patent Claims5

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION8

 A. Pharmaceutical Batch9

 B. Pharmaceutical Product10

 C. “[C]ontacting the solution comprising treprostinil from step (b) with a base to form a salt of treprostinil”11

 D. Storing, Storage11

 E. A Salt Treprostinil12

 F. Liquidia’s Implicit Constructions Are Not the Plain and Ordinary Meaning12

 G. Liquidia Ignores the '901 Patent’s Different Claim Types14

 H. Liquidia Improperly Construes the Instituted Claims as “Substantively Similar” to the Claims in the '393 IPR14

IV. THE GROUNDS RELY ON IMPROPER EVIDENCE17

 A. The Winkler Declaration is Not Evidence Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.6317

 B. Prof. Winkler Failed to Support His Opinion18

 C. Prof. Winkler Does Not Understand Inherency in Obviousness21

V.	THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL MUST HAVE APPROPRIATE TRAINING OR SKILL IN PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURING	22
VI.	GROUND 1: PHARES FAILS TO RENDER CLAIMS 1-9 OBVIOUS.....	27
A.	Phares Alone Does Not Render Claim 1 Obvious	29
1.	Liquidia fails to explain why a POSA would modify Phares	29
2.	Claim 1 requires a pharmaceutical batch consisting of treprostinil and impurities	35
3.	Phares Does Not Teach Treprostinil Synthesis	38
4.	Phares does not teach a pharmaceutical batch of at least 2.9 grams	43
5.	Phares does not cite to U.S. Patent No. 4,306,075 for selectively alkylating a benzindene triol.....	45
6.	Ege, Schoffstall, Wiberg, and Kawakami are irrelevant to claim 1, and do not cure any of Phares’s deficiencies	46
B.	Phares Alone Does Not Render Claim 2 Obvious	49
C.	Phares Alone Does Not Render Claims 3-5 Obvious	49
D.	Phares Alone Does Not Render Claims 6 and 7 Obvious.....	50
E.	Phares Alone Does Not Render Claims 8 and 9 Obvious.....	51
VII.	GROUND 2: MORIARTY AND PHARES FAIL TO RENDER CLAIMS 1-9 OBVIOUS	51
A.	UT is Not Precluded from Addressing Motivation to Combine	52
B.	Phares and Moriarty are Directed to Different Problems	54
C.	Moriarty with Phares Does Not Render Claim 1 Obvious.....	56
1.	Moriarty and Phares do not teach the same process steps, and there is no motivation to combine these references in the way recited in claim 1	57

2.	A product from Moriarty and Phares does not inherently include the same resulting impurities	62
D.	Moriarty with Phares Does Not Render Claims 6 and 7 Obvious	65
VIII.	EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS FURTHER ESTABLISHES UNOBVIOUSNESS, WHICH LIQUIDIA IGNORES	66
IX.	THIS PROCEEDING IS NOT CONSTITUTIONAL	69
X.	CONCLUSION.....	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	68
<i>B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1293 (2015).....	51
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	11
<i>Crown Operations Intern., Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002)....	28
<i>Crown Ops. Int’l v. Solutia</i> , 289 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	62
<i>Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	23
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	48
<i>In re Craig</i> , 411 F.2d 1333 (CCPA 1969).....	4
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	65
<i>In re Newell</i> , 891 F.2d 899 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	62
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation</i> , 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	59
<i>In re Soni</i> , 54 F.3d 7460 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	65, 66
<i>King v. Alston</i> , 75 F.3d 657 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	69
<i>KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	55
<i>Murphy v. NCAA</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1461 (2018).....	70
<i>Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , 924 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	53

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.